

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed September 8, 2005, claims 1-16, 19, and 21 were rejected. Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. All the pending claims at issue are believed to be patentable over the cited references.

Claims 1, 7, 12, 14-16 and 18 have been amended. No claims have been added.

SPECIFICATION

Paragraph [0022] in the specification is amended to assign reference numeral 100 to the antenna system in two instances. The revision is merely typographical in nature, and no new material is introduced thereby.

Paragraph [0032] in the specification is amended to expressly identify by reference numeral the loop 450 of analog coaxial conductor, shown in FIG. 4 and identified by function in the paragraph prior to the amendment. A second occurrence of --antenna array 400-- is made explicit in the paragraph. No new material is introduced by these revisions.

Paragraph [0033] in the specification, last line, is amended to revise a word choice, namely the use of the word "preview" where --purview-- is appropriate and was intended. The revision is merely typographical in nature, and is not presented in response to an Office Action. No new material is introduced thereby.

DRAWINGS

FIGS. 1 and 4 are objected to, as noted above. Specifically, an unlabeled lead line in FIG. 1 is, as suggested in the Office Action, superfluous. In addition, multiple antenna radiant elements "440" in FIG. 4, corresponding in size and orientation to similar elements 170 in FIG. 1 and others in FIGS. 2 and 3, are identified with reference numerals but not discussed. Because the function of the elements 440 is adequately addressed elsewhere in the specification, the reference numerals 440 are omitted. No new material is introduced by these revisions.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner stated in paragraph 4, line 1 of the Office Action that claims 1-16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In reviewing the entire Office Action, Applicants believe that claim 20 was intended to be allowed, with claim 21 rejected instead. On that basis, and in light of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-16, 19, and 21 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Regarding claims 1 and 12, the term “cable” is replaced by the term --capable-- in both claims. Applicants respectfully submit that “... [a-to-b] couplers, cable of transferring...” has no evident meaning, while “... [a-to-b] couplers, capable of transferring...” is grammatically correct and plausible in the context of the claim. Applicants further submit that these amendments overcome the rejection of claims 1 and 12, as well as those of claims 2-6, depending from claim 1, and claim 13, depending from claim 12, and introduce no new material.

Regarding claim 7, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments presented above, including the revisions suggested by the Examiner, overcome the rejection of claim 7, as well as those of claims 8-11, depending from claim 7, and introduce no new material.

Regarding claims 14-16, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments presented above, including the revisions suggested by the Examiner, overcome the rejection of claims 14 and 15, as well as that of claim 16, depending from claim 15, and introduce no new material.

Amendments to claims 16 and 18 are entirely typographical. As such, no new material is introduced by the amendments.

Regarding claims 19 and 21, Applicants are unsure as to the reason for rejecting these claims, in view of the Examiner’s finding that claim 17, from which they depend, is allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable at least by reason of their dependency from claim 17.

In light of the foregoing arguments, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-16, 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner is thanked for finding that claims 17, 18, and 20 are allowable, and that claims 1-16, 19, and 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments indicated above fully address the rejections, and that claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request all the objections and rejections to the specification, drawings, and claims be removed. If, for any reason, the Examiner disagrees, please call the undersigned attorney at 202-861-1703 in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding before issuing another action. The undersigned attorney is confident that any issue which might remain can readily be worked out by telephone.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 87202.1840.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Dennis P. Cawley
Reg. No. 44,598

Date: 1/10/2006
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1500
Facsimile: 202-861-1783

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please substitute the sheets of drawings submitted herewith for the sheets of drawings pending in the application.

FIGS. 1 and 4 are revised to overcome objections. The redundant lead line in FIG. 1 is deleted. With regard to FIG. 4, reference numeral 450, shown unchanged in the drawing, is identified explicitly in amended specification paragraph [0032], and multiple occurrences of reference numeral 440 and associated lead lines are deleted from the drawing as amended. No new material is introduced thereby.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets containing FIGS. 1 and 4, respectively.